Responses to reviewer 3 comments:

a) The paper was proofread by English native speaker dr. Paul McGuiness. The certificate of proofreading is attached.

b) In generally the repeatability of the welding conditions in our research is not important because the article discuss the different determination methods of admixing rate. The repeatability of the results of admixing rate is important not the repeatability of welding conditions because the article do not discuss the effect of welding conditions on the admixing rate. If the results of different methods match well it means that admixing rate is well determinate, testing methods are appropriate and the repeatability of the results of the applied methods is guaranteed.

If in 8 different welds which were made with 8 different coated electrodes practically the same results of admixing rate would be obtained, then this may put a shadow on the value of the admixing rate. However, this impossible due to different composition of coating of electrodes. Our results of admixing rate which are in the range of 20 – 40 % confirm your comment about low repeatability conditions of welding. On the other hand, it is well known that in the single weld the welding conditions never fluctuate as much as our results of admixing if it is welded by experienced welder. If we can assume that 8 different cross-sections of 8 different weld are taken from one single weld it is clear that the average value of admixing rate in a single weld with applied methods will be determined very precisely despite fluctuations of welding conditions.

Regarding the comment about the average values of welding parameters: The average values of welding parameters were applied only for the theoretical analyse where for the calculations the average values are always used. Despite that we put the parameters range in the text.

c) Since macroscopic cross-sections of the welds were taken by camera it is very hard to put the exact scale bar in the Figures. Therefore, we rather wrote the real width of the presented welds in figure captions.

d) Because of suggestions of one of the other reviewers the article was partly reconstructed. Also new Table (Table 4) was inserted. All modifications in the text are highlighted.

We would like to thank you for your remarks and suggestions which have improved the paper quality.

Hoping that the above mentioned changes in the manuscript and our answers will satisfy all reviewer comments, I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Assist. prof. Borut Zorc